Translation





PCT

529319

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

	,						
Applicant's or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER AC	CTION See Notific	cation of Transmittal of International Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)				
International application No.	International filing dat	e (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)				
PCT/FR2003/003293	04 novembre 200	03 (04.11.2003)	05 novembre 2002 (05.11.2002)				
International Patent Classification (IPC) or n C07K 14/315	ational classification and	I IPC					
Applicant UNIVERSITE DE LA MEDITERRANEE (AIX-MARSEILLE II)							
 This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36. 							
2. This REPORT consists of a total of	sheets,	including this cover sl	heet.				
This report is also accompani amended and are the basis for 70.16 and Section 607 of the	r this report and/or sheet:	s containing rectificat	on, claims and/or drawings which have been tions made before this Authority (see Rule				
These annexes consist of a to	tal of si	heets.	·				
3. This report contains indications rela	ting to the following iten	ns:					
I Basis of the report							
II Priority							
III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability							
IV Lack of unity of inve	ention						
V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement							
VI Certain documents of	ited						
VII Certain defects in the	e international applicatio	n					
VIII Certain observations on the international application							
Date of submission of the demand Date of completion of this report							
		Date of completion of	•				
16 avril 2004 (16.04.2004)		01 M	farch 2005 (01.03.2005)				
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP		Authorized officer					
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.					



International application No.

PCT/FR2003/003293

I	. Basis	of the r	report			
1	. With	regard t	to the elements of the international application:*			
		the into	ternational application as originally filed			
	\boxtimes	the des	escription:	•		
1		pages	1-49	, as originally filed		
Í		pages		, filed with the demand		
ŀ		pages	, filed with the letter of	, mod with the demand		
ļ	\boxtimes	the cla				
l	كيكا	pages				
		pages		, as originally filed		
ļ.,		pages	, as amended (together with a			
1		pages	, filed with the letter of	, filed with the demand		
l	\square	the dro	awings:			
ĺ		pages	•			
İ		pages	1-1	, as originally filed		
Ì		pages				
l			, filed with the letter of			
1	ш	the seque	ence listing part of the description:			
		pages		, as originally filed		
ļ		pages		, filed with the demand		
١		pages	, filed with the letter of			
2.		e elemen the lan the lan	nguage of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1 nguage of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).	which is:		
		01 33.3				
3.	prelii	contair	I to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international a examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing: ined in the international application in written form.	pplication, the international		
ĺ	\forall	filed together with the international application in computer readable form.				
	\bowtie		hed subsequently to this Authority in written form.			
ł	h		hed subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.			
		mema	statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go be ational application as filed has been furnished.			
	M	The sta	tatement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the furnished.	written sequence listing has		
4.		The am	mendments have resulted in the cancellation of:			
			the description, pages			
			the claims, Nos.			
•			the drawings, sheets/fig			
5.		This rep	port has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).**	have been considered to go		
	and 7	0.1 <i>1</i>).	sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation und t as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not conta	in amenaments (Rule 70.16		
**	Any re	eplaceme 	nent sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to th	is report.		

INTERNATIONAL PRESENTINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

	V. Re	easoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
ı		

. Statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	6-13, 15, 16, 18	YES
	Claims	1-5, 14, 17, 19	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	6-13, 15, 16, 18	YES
	Claims	1-5, 14, 17, 19	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-13, 15-19	YES
	Claims	14	NO

2. Citations and explanations

- 1. This report makes reference to the following documents:
 - D1: EMBL Database

Accession Number AE00141199

D2: EMBL Database

Accession Number AE006480

D3: EMBL Database

Accession Number AE009961

D4: EMBL Database

Accession Number AE008542

D5: EMBL Database

Accession Number AE015022

D6: US-B-6420135

D7: WO 02/077021

- Document D8 was not cited in the international search report. A copy of that document is attached.
 - D8: WPI Database

Derwent publications AN 2004-101891

& FR-A-2,824,074 (31 October 2002)

3. D1 describes the rpoB gene sequence of the

Streptococcus agalactiae bacteria (4582-8157 nucleotides). That sequence shows 99.4% identity with the nucleotide sequences of SEQ ID No. 22 and 23 in the present application. Regardless of its high identity rate with SEQ ID No. 22, the sequence described in D1 shows differences from the sequence of SEQ ID No. 22 in the present application at positions 1-4, 7, 704, 706 and 730 of SEQ ID No. 22. For this reason, the sequence described in D1 is not excluded from the scope of claim 1.

The scope of claim 3 includes sequences showing at least 98.7% homology with the sequences of SEQ ID No. 8-35. The sequence described in D1 shows more than 98.7% identity with the sequences of SEQ ID No. 22 and 23. Consequently, the subject matter of claims 1 and 3 is not novel over D1 (PCT Article 33(2)).

4. D8 describes, in particular, the rpoB gene sequence of the Streptococcus agalactiae bacteria. The sequences described in D8 show, in particular, more than 99% identity with the nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID No. 22 in the present application. D8 also mentions diagnostic (and hence detection) methods for bacteria, said methods being based on the use of these sequences, as well as kits used to implement these methods (abstract; SEQ ID No. 127 and 6499).

Consequently, the subject matter of claims 14, 17 and 19 is not novel over D8 (PCT Article 33(2)).

5. Claims 1-3 and 14 refer to sequences showing "at least 98.7% homology". However, since the present application does not contain a definition of the

term "homology" that would diverge from the generally recognised definition, the latter should be evaluated as having the meaning a person skilled in the art would normally give it. The term "homology" means that these sequences have a common origin. Claims 1-3 and 14 thus refer to sequences having a common origin. The rpoB genes described in documents D1-D8 have a common origin with the rpoB genes of SEQ ID No. 1-3, 5 and 8-35 described in the present application. Consequently, the subject matter of claims 1-5, 14, 17 and 19 is not novel over D1, D2, D3, D4, D5, D6, D7 or D8 (PCT Article 33(2)).

6. Should the applicant succeed in overcoming the above objections on the grounds of lack of novelty, the Examining Authority is of the opinion that the subject matter of claims 1-5, 14, 17 and 19 cannot be considered inventive for the following reasons:

Documents D1-D5 describe the *rpoB* gene sequence of various bacteria of the *Streptococcus* genus. Those sequences show very high identity with the nucleotide sequences of SEQ ID No. 1-35 in the present application. In view of D1, a person skilled in the art would be able to arrive automatically at the subject matter of claims 1-5 by putting into practice his basic knowledge and routine hybridisation and/or PCR techniques. For example, hybridisation techniques based on the use of coding sequences of *rpoB* genes do not require the generation of any particular primer. Claims 1-5 are therefore not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

D6-D8 describe the rpoB gene sequence of

Streptococcus pneumoniae (D6 and D7) and Streptococcus agalactiae (D8). Those sequences show very high identity with the nucleotide sequences of SEQ ID No. 1-35. D6-D8 also mention the use of these sequences in methods for detecting bacteria of the Streptococcus genus, as well as kits required to carry out said diagnosis (D6: abstract, SEQ ID No. 46 and 111, column 23, line 53 - column 24, line 53; D7: abstract, SEQ ID No. 4984 and 4085, pages 4, 5, 33 and 34). In view of D6, D7 or D8, all of which describe the rpoB genes of bacteria of the Streptococcus genus showing very high identity with the claimed rpoB genes and gene fragments, a person skilled in the art would automatically arrive at the subject matter of claims 1-5, 14, 17 and 19 by putting into practice his basic knowledge and routine hybridisation and/or PCR techniques. These claims are therefore not inventive (PCT Article 33(3)).

- 7. The description of the present application does not mention sequences showing less than 98.7% homology. The subject matter of claims 1-3 and 14 is thus not entirely supported by the description (PCT Article 6).
- 8. The prior art does not describe or suggest the consensus sequences of SEQ ID No. 6 and 7.

 Consequently, claims 6-13, 15, 16 and 18 appear to be novel and inventive (PCT Article 33(2) and 33(3)).
- 9. In the PCT Contracting States, there are no uniform criteria for assessing the industrial applicability of claim 14 in its present form. Patentability can

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

Internal application No.
PCT/FR 03/03293

also depend on the wording of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognise the industrial applicability of claims to the use of a compound in a medical treatment; it does, however, allow claims to the first use of a known compound in a medical treatment or to the use of such a compound in the manufacture of a drug for a new medical treatment.